DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 335 938 FL 019 428

AUTHOR Dogancay, Seran
TITLE "Your Eye Is Sparkling": Formulaic Expressions and Routines in Turkish.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 17p.; In: Penn Working Papers in Educational Linguistics, Volume 6, Number 2; see FL 019 424.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beliefs; Cultural Traits; Discourse Analysis; *Idioms; *Language Patterns; *Oral Language; Proverbs; *Social Values; *Turkish; Uncommonly Taught Languages

ABSTRACT

There are certain pre-coded (formulaic) utterances conventionally triggered by certain communication situations, and their use is expected and deemed appropriate because they are seen as part of everyday politeness formulas. Lack of an English equivalent indicates cultural differences governing their use. Some routines are taught explicitly and their use is prompted by adults in socializing children. These expressions are part of every competent speaker's repertoire, and include proverbs, idioms, greetings, apologies, thanks, and leave-taking. Turkish is rich in formulaic expressions, both spoken and written, evidenced in proverbs, idioms, and one-word formulas serving different functions in different contexts. A study investigated the structure and function of such routines in Turkish in naturally-occurring and filmed conversations of a variety of individuals. Subjects were equal numbers of males and females aged 30-55. Only two of the formulaic expressions identified were proverbs; the remainder were pragmatic idioms. Analysis indicates that the expressions were used as politeness devices, helping the conversation progress smoothly. It is concluded that the study of prefabricated, routinized expressions can reveal both a substantial part of the native speaker's communicative competence and the values and beliefs of the society. A 31-item bibliography is included. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dogancay

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED335938

Your eye is sparkling: Formulaic expressions and routines in Turkish[1]

Seran Dogancay

This paper reviews the literature on formulaic expressions and their importance to the field of TESOL. Dogancay analyzes the structure and function of formulaic expressions in taped conversations of native speakers of Turkish. She describes different structures and functions of pragmatic idioms: those using exaggeration, negative connotations, or self-reference, those occuring in adjacency pairs, and others. Dogancay concludes that the study of prefabricated expressions can reveal not only a substantial part of the communicative competence of the native speakers of a language, but also the values and beliefs of a society.

When I was a child, I used to stay with my grandmother during the summer holidays and we would recount our dreams over breakfast. When I would start to recount my dream from the previous night, my grandmother would say, "*Hayirdir insallah*" [God grant it be good]. But when I failed to say anything when it was her turn to relate her dream, she would tell me, "say '*hayirdir inşallah*'," prompting me to utter this conventionalized linguistic formula.

This anecdote serves to point out three factors about formulaic expressions. First, there are certain pre-coded utterances that are conventionally triggered by certain events and their use is expected and deemed appropriate (though not necessarily obligatory) because they are felt to be part of everyday politeness formulae. Second, the fact that English does not have an equivalent formula in its repertoire of conversational routines shows that there are cultural differences governing their usage. And finally, some of these routines are explicitly taught and their use is prompted by adults during the course of socializing children. This latter point seems especially relevant for those routines that serve as politeness formulae in a society. Indeed, all of us have witnessed scenes of parents' prompting their children to say 'please' and 'thank you' to adults. When children accept a gift with just a smile,

FL019428

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

parents tell them, "Say 'thank you' Joe," or more indirectly, "Aren't we supposed to say something, Joe?"

Davies (1987) draws attention to the fact that these politeness formulae are one of the few components of a language which parents attempt to teach their children. Gleason and Weintraub (1975) say that ritualized formulae are acquired differently from the rest of a language. Ferguson (1979) goes even further by suggesting that these ritualized formulae might be part of the innate predisposition to language. He finds it surprising that such formulae, which he calls "little snippets of ritual used in everyday encounters between people" (1979: 137), have been little studied, despite the fact that all speech communities seem to utilize them in everyday interactions, though to varying extents.

It is indeed true that formulaic expressions and routines have not received much attention from linguists, possibly because of the focus of generative linguistics on the creative aspects of language. The second language aquisition literature, on the other hand, gives attention to prefabricated patterns as good strategies to memorize in order to communicate in certain situations (Hakuta, 1974). Hatch (1981) regards them as important devices for triggering the provision of input.

The fact that routine expressions are regarded as clichéd or common speech possibly plays a role in their not receiving the attention they deserve. Basil Bernstein's (1971) inclusion of them in the so-called 'restricted code,' hence associating them with stigmatized speech patterns of the lower classes, is another indication of negative attitudes toward formulaic expressions. The reality is that everyone in a community uses certain formulaic expressions by virtue of the fact that they are part of everyday rituals which "regulate public order" (Goffman, 1971).

Definitions

So far, I have not been using a systematic label to refer to pre-coded, conventionalized routines which can be found in almost every society's linguistic repertoire. I would like to start with their definitions and functions as given in the literature and then look at their usage by speakers of Turkish.

Formulaic expressions or routines are generally defined as conventionalized, pre-coded expressions whose occurence is triggered by standardized communication situations. They are part of every competent speaker's repertoire and show "tacit agreements which the members of a community presume to be shared by every

reasonable co-member. In embodying societal knowledge they are essential in the handling of day-to-day situations" (Coulmas, 1981b: 4). Linguistic routines are social phenomena whose meaning and function need to be analyzed in their socio-cultural context. Proverbs and other ready-made patterns such as idiomatic expressions, greetings, apologies, leave-taking and the like are generally made up of routinized linguistic formulae whose use is more or less automatically triggered by situational circumstances.

Frequency and distribution of prefabricated routines are determined mainly by the social organization of the speech community, and the structural make-up of its language. Some carry special roles in the language, fulfilling many functions. Proverbs especially have a great role in African languages. Nwoye (1989) explains how linguistic politeness and impoliteness are expressed mainly by indirectness through the use of proverbs in the Igbo of southeastern Nigeria. Igbo proverbs serve the purpose of hedges in English. Knowledge and wise use of proverbs is highly regarded in society. Generally speaking, the more tradition-oriented societies display higher frequencies in their use of formulae which enjoy currency and respect in the community. In talking about Japanese apologies and thanking behavior, Coulmas (1981b) says that formulaic utterances are not considered as lacking in any real context since more important than originality is the ability to say the right thing in the right place. This also applies to greeting formulae by the Wolof (Irvine, 1974). Yet, even in non-traditional societies where individual creativity is valued, such as the United States, there are many expressions which are routinized, for example, greetings, leave-taking, apologies. Others, such as complimenting behavior, also display a highly routinized occurrence, somewhat contrary to expectations. As Manes and Wolfson (1981) showed after a detailed analysis of compliments which revealed their almost total lack of originality, this speech act is characterized by the formulaic nature of its syntactic and semantic compositions. It is interesting that such a phenomenon is so common in American English, whose speakers value individuality and originality.

In her study of 130,000 words of spontaneous speech, concentrating on hesitation phenomena in Canadian English, Sorhus (1977) argues that 20% of the words were prepatterned phrases fulfilling the function of fillers and giving the speakers time to verbalize their ideas. Therefore, we need to apply caution in making generalizations about the use of formulaic expressions since there are many speech acts, some of them still unnamed, whose study might reveal ritualized language use.

If one can justifiably generalize a large and as diverse a population as the Turks of Turkey and Cyprus as a tradition-oriented nation, one can expect to observe many routines in their linguistic repertoire. Within the body of this paper I will be looking at formulaic expressions in Turkish - all the prepatterned routines that emerge from the data - and attempt to analyze their structure and function as used by the sample of native speakers.

The Turkish language is rich in the range of formulaic expressions which reveal themselves in the body of proverbs, idiomatic expressions, situational formulae and the like to decorate both the spoken and the written channels. In Turkish, proverbs are defined as pre-formulated sentences which are conventionalized and easy to remember and they are believed to have been passed on from our ancestors to become part of the culture's verbal repertoire. Sometimes they are prefaced by "As our ancestors say...," especially when serving didactic purposes. They are accepted to be the product of the thinking human being, created by the experiences of one which then gain public/social value. Turkish proverbs sometimes show regional diversity, hence revealing the emphasis, life-style, etc., of a region, while many are recognized by everyone.

Proverbs are defined as a genre collecting many thoughts and ideas into the body of one utterance, which is then used to further some social purpose. Seitel (1976: 25) defines proverbs as the "strategic social use of metaphor as the manifestation in traditional, artistic and relatively short form of metaphorical reasoning, used in an interactional context to serve certain purposes". Proverbs are indicators of moral values based on experiences and thoughts. Turkish scholars (Bahadinli, 1971; Oy, 1972) define their functions as the giving of implicit advice in a way that show solutions to problems, describe experiences and general truths, and express and reinforce the customs and traditions of the society.

In Turkish, proverbs put a great deal of emphasis on patriotism, bravery, wisdom, patience, hospitality, family, friendship and justice, hence combining in themselves the linguistic and cultural unity of the society. Proverbs also adapt themselves to the changing social life of a country and new ones emerge accordingly. Those proverbs stressing disappearing values are still used, especially by the elderly, often with a touch of nostalgia, to talk about the 'good old days.'

Formulaic routines also reveal themselves in the large body of idiomatic expressions used by the Turkish language. Following Bahadinli (1971) I would like to differentiate between proverbs - called *atasözü* in Turkish (what ancestors say) - and *deyim* (sayings). Turkish proverbs are generally prescriptive, showing invariable

truths and they are made up of whole sentences. Sayings, are made up of two or more words carrying idiomatic meanings and are used to express ideas in a non-prescriptive and indirect way. Overlaps sometimes occur between these two categories.

There are many standardized communication situations in our everyday lives which trigger automatic responses. A set of routines emerging from the data described later (taped conversations) provide good examples for these 'situational formulae,' to borrow Zimmer's term. Some of these occur in adjacency pairs, calling for specific second moves. For example:

(1) *Allaha ismarladik* [I recommend you to God] - Said by a person leaving.

(2) *Güle güle* [laughing, laughing] - Said by the person staying behind.

Therefore, there are certain rules governing the use of these situational formulas.

Note that *güle güle* can occur in conjunction with other words; adapting itself to the situation and forming part of a politeness formula used to convey good wishes, hence trying to establish rapport. Examples are *Güle güle giy* [wear it laughingly] , used to refer to a new piece of clothing, *Güle güle oturun* [may you live here laughingly (happily)], used to a person who moved into a new place. Formulae such as these constitute a common speech act which has no label describing it. Verschueren (1981) calls these "forgotten formulae." Indeed, in Turkish one can see many routinized formulae such as those shown above which are used as part of politeness strategies, with no specific lexical label.

There are other formulae, usually one-word, which serve different functions depending on the context they occur in. Bayraktaroglu's (1979) analysis of *Estağfurullah* as a second item in an adjacency pair shows how context/topic specific this formula is. It can mean "I ask pardon of God," "Don't mention it," and "No trouble at all," besides being used as a repair strategy, reprimand, or a strategy for downgrading the speaker and upgrading the listener. Formulae such as this enable the speaker to respond in appropriate ways, sometimes even enabling them to avoid specific, straightforward answers in a socially acceptable way. For instance, *Insallah* can be used as an appropriate response to a suggestion or invitation without making a commitment. It can mean 'hopefully,' or 'if God permits,' hence shifting the decision or the ability to fulfil the other's wish from the self to the powers of God. This is a socially acceptable politeness strategy which functions to indicate to the listener that the speaker may not really be interested, without committing a "face threatening act" (Brown and Levinson, 1987).

There are a subset of formulae in Turkish that appeal to the goodwill of God by expressing an awareness of his power and by asking for his help. These explicitly use the word *Allah* [God], for example: *Allah yetiştirsin* [May God help raise him/her], refering to someone's child. This shows an expression of good wishes on the part of the speaker. The response to this can be *Amin* [Amen] or *Teşekkür ederim* [Thank you]. These are some of the examples from the large body of formulaic, prefabricated expressions in Turkish which serve to fulfill certain functions during the course of interactions.

According to Malinowski (1923), prefabricated routines serve the function of "phatic communion" as instruments establishing personal bonds based on our need to form friendly relationships. This is only one of their functions however. As Coulmas (1981b) argues, it may not even be true for some of them. Formulaic expressions are also used to reduce the complexity of the social situation by giving speakers linguistic tools to fit situations appropriately in cases where they do not have time to create original utterances. They are socially recognized ways of interacting in certain situations and due to their being part of native speakers' shared background they prevent communication breakdowns and misunderstanding. They can also signify group membership. They do not require negotiation by virtue of the fact that they are part of everyone's repertoire whether they use them frequently or not. They can serve as indirect polite formulae, and to borrow Goffman's (1971) phrase, they are good devices to "regulate behavior in public places," due to the fact that successful interaction depends on standardized ways of organizing interpersonal encounters which Goffman refers to as "interaction rituals." In short, by equipping speakers with valuable tools to carry out social interactions in an appropriate way to the culture, all forms of formulaic expressions are valuable as part of a native speaker's "communicative competence" (Hymes, 1968) guiding their participation in interactions.

In the remaining part of this paper I will be looking at spoken data from Turkish in an attempt to see the structure and function of routines as used by speakers.

The Study

Data collection procedure

The data were collected by tape-recording naturally occuring conversations in three different settings involving a range of people representing both sexes equally. My living abroad here in the U.S. with few Turkish speakers to interact with made it

difficult to collect naturalistic data. Data collected here was supplemented by two tapes sent by my mother from my home country, the Turkish division of Cyprus. The settings were a house in West Philadelphia, my house in Cyprus and my mother's office. All conversations were informal ones among friends, collegues and family involving people who all knew one another quite well.

Subjects

Approximately equal numbers of males and females between 30-55 years old made up the subjects. The majority were middle class and some came from different geographical locations and backgrounds. They were all native speakers of Turkish. The tapes done in Philadelphia involved people from Turkey who speak with a different accent than the Turkish Cypriots. The dialects show differences in pronunciation and some vocabulary; nevertheless, they represent the same language.

The subjects were told that I needed some Turkish data for a study and they were aware of being tape-recorded. Awareness of oneself as an object of study obviously makes one conscious of one's speech behavior. It is difficult to tell to what extent this influenced the frequency of formulaic expressions in the data, if at all. Personally knowing all the subjects involved in the conversations makes it somewhat easier for me to assess their relative social status and relationships with one another. In general, I can say that the tapes involve informal coffee-hour conversations and family gatherings, hence providing natural data.

Another tape I listened to is from a movie showing life in a Turkish jail. This obviously does not represent natural, spontaneous conversation but still reveals the use of formulaic expressions in their appropriate contexts.

Results and Analysis

The analysis was done by identifying the formulaic expressions based on my communicative competence as a native speaker of Turkish. Their having a ritualized, pre-formulated form makes them easier to recognize since they show very little variation and are shared by all native speakers. Further analysis was done by categorizing the emerging expressions into groups according to their forms.

A range of formulaic expressions were found in the data, only two of them being proverbs whereas the vast majority were idiomatic expressions called 'pragmatic idioms' by Coulmas (1979). The latter were in the form of short, easy to remember phrases/sentences used to express ideas in a politer, more indirect or decorative way, sometimes exaggerating things to emphasize the strength of emotion felt at the time:

(1) *Dünya yerinden oynadi* [The world moved on its axes] - Used to refer to an event which had a great impact.

(2) *Akli hayali durdu* [His mind and imagination stopped] - Used to show great astonishment.

Other sayings were used to express ideas in an indirect, almost story-like manner:

(3) *A'nin ipiyle kuyuya inersen isin zordur* [If you go down the well using A's rope, you'll have a hard time] - meaning that A is an unreliable person.

(4) *Istedigini yag eder, istedigini bal* [He'll make some things into oil, others into honey] - used to refer to someone who is not fair, acting in favor of some things and not on others depending on his attitude towards the people or issues involved.

(5) *Birisini adam yerine koymak* [To put someone into a man's place] - to respect someone.

(6) *Gözü disarda* [His eye is outside] - meaning someone who is on the lookout for something or someone.

(3) - (6) are pragmatic idioms carrying negative connotations. They are used to make a point, expressing somewhat unfavorable judgements of the people referred to. On the basis of these one may argue that a function of certain idiomatic expressions is to criticize people without being too rude or crude but getting one's meaning across all the same. The above examples show formulaic expressions as part of the language of evaluation, conveying directly or indirectly the speakers' negative or positive attitudes.

Other patterns referred to speakers themselves:

(7) *Alnim acik* [My forehead is clear] - meaning that the speaker is free from sins and has nothing to hide.

This reveals the Turkish belief that one cannot keep things secret for long, and that having nothing bad to hide is a valued attribute in the culture.

The following formula shows the context dependent nature of certain pragmatic idioms:

(8) *Güzü tutmak* [The eye got a hold on him] - can mean: a) that the speaker formed trust in the person referred to, or b) that the speaker thinks that the referent had an evil eye which influenced events in a bad way.

The latter point revels the superstitious nature of the Turks.

A second set of formulaic expressions occured in the form of adjacency pairs, triggered by the occurence of certain situations and/or events, hence displaying their ritualistic nature. These are what Coulmas (1979) calls 'repetitive phrases,' a part of routine formulae. In Coulmas's definition these are:

> ...expressions whose ocurence is closely bound to specific social situations and which are, on the basis of an evaluation of such situations, highly predictable in a communicative course of events. Their meaning is pragmatically conditoned, and their usage is motivatied by the relevant characteristics of such social situations (1979: 240).

Note that these repetitive phrases do not carry idiomatic meanings, unlike the examples given so far.

Ferguson (1979) calls these 'politeness formulae'; fixed expressions conventionally used for purposes of greeting, leave-taking, thanking, etc. Some examples are:

(9) -*Tesekkür ederim, zahmet oldu* [Thank you, it was such trouble for you]
-*Yok canim, ne zahmeti* [No, not the slightest bit]
or -*Estagfurullah* [Don't mention it]

(10) -*Gecmis olsun* [May it be past]
-*Sagoi* [Be alive] - a thanking formula

(11) -*Eline saglik* [Health to your hand] - to the person who did the cooking
-*Afiyet olsun* [*Bon apetit*]

Tannen and Öztek (1981) classify (10) as a formula in their 'anxiety-provoking' category as part of those formulae referring to health such that it is used to people who are ill or just recovering. It also has a specific use in another context: expressing good wishes to people in jail. This can still be categorized as an anxiety-provoking event but is not related to health or loss of someone since (10) can also be used to people who have lost a relative, close friend, etc.

(11) draws attention to the fact that *bon apetit* can be used in Turkish both before and after a meal, whereas in French it is used only at the beginning as an invitation to start the meal. A specific formula does not exist in English for the especific situation. This can show what kind of pragmatic interference might occur when learners of a language transfer formlulas from their nartive language into the target language. Observations about the ways in which such formulae may differ across a variety of languages have been made by Davies (1987), Drazdauskiene (1981), Ferguson (1970), James (1980), Richards and Sukwiwat (1983), Riley (1981), and Tannen and Öztek (1981).

Other examples of adjacency pairs were:

(12) -*Hadi gözün aydin* [your eye is sparkling] - said to a person whose friend or relative has arrived, or after a happy event.

-*Aydinlikta ol* [You be in light too] - meaning, 'I hope this happens to you too.'

(13) -*Serefe* [To your honor] - Cheers.

-*Serefe* - This is an optional second move since one can respond by just raising one's glass.

In some cases one has a choice of appropriate second moves, depending on the situation and the topic of interaction, as well as the social identity of the interlocutors. For example,

(14) -*Tesekkür ederim* [Thank you]

- a) *Helal olsun* [It's lawful]

b) *Birsey degil* [It's nothing]

(14)-a is more likely to be used by an older person than a younger one and it has somewhat religious overtones, whereas (14)-b is neutral. The person who replies, therefore, can reveal his age and religious orientation. This can also be shown in the way people thank others:

(15) -*Nasilsiniz?* [How are you?]

-a) *Sagol iyiyim* [I'm fine, you be alive]

b) *Allaha sükür iyiyim* [Thanks to God, I am fine]

The first response thanks the person asking whereas the second one thanks God for being fine. This phenomenon is also common in Yiddish, as shown by Matisoff (1979) who calls them 'psycho-ostensives' as formulae showing the speaker's attitudes and emotions towards what they are talking about.

In fact there were some routines involving the word 'God' and appealing to the good will of God by expressing his power or by asking for his aid:

(16) *Allah yetistirsin* [May God raise him/her] - referring to one's own or other's children.

(17) *Allah iyilik saglik versin* [May God give peace and health]

(18) *Allah korusun* [May God protect/ God Forbid]

(19) *Allah kurtarsin* [May God save]

(16) - (19) are not required in speech, though those occuring in adjacency pairs are. Since the situational formulae are expected as part of the societal norms, what happens in cases when the hearer fails to respond, or when they are not used at all? Does a communication breadown occur?

Ferguson (1979) gives an anecdote about how not replying verbally to the 'good morning' from his secretary caused tension in the work place and made people give him strange looks, almost as if asking what was wrong. "The importance of our

trivial, muttered more-or-less automatic polite phrases becomes clear when they are omitted or not acknowledged" (140-141). Misuse or failure to use certain formulaic expressions would not in most cases cause communication breakdowns but would be perceived as lack of politeness.

The above situational formulae are quite obligatory. For example, responding to a good wish with gratitude or using a greeting formula (*Hosgeldin - Hosbulduk*) but failing to say 'bless you' when somebody sneezes is not obligatory, at least for the native speaker norms and expectations I have.

It is difficult to classify most of these ritualized formulaic expressions as absolutely required or not since the social identity of the interlocutors and the situation form the major determining factors. Some formulae such as 'bless you' after a sneeze or *hayirdir insallah* before recounting a dream may be deemed required by one, while not expected at all by another. It seems to me that more tradition-oriented older people know and use more formulaic expressions. Indeed, when, why and by whom certain formulaic expressions are expected can be an interesting study, saying something about the social structure of a community.

Certain formulae were used to ask for forgiveness or to be believed, some approximating begging:

(20) *Kurban olayim* [I'll sacrifice myself] - used as a very strong form of asking for something.

(21) *Vallahi* [I swear I am telling the truth]

(22) *Allah askina* [For God's sake] - again, used to ask for something.

A number of routines were used to refer to general truths or to concepts accepted by the society, in order to make a point in a simple, shared way:

(23) *Yas 35 yolun yarisi* [Age 35, it's half way] - meaning when you reach 35 you're half way through with your life. This used to express the speaker's belief that the person referred to (which can be oneself) is getting old. This was originally a line from a famous poem which then acquired public value and use.

(24) *Neysek oyuz* [We are what we are]

(25) *Iyilik, saglik olsun* [As long as we have health and peace] - meaning that these are the most important things in life.

(26) *Ruhun genc olsun* [As long as your soul is young] - This is used to indicate the general belief that it's not your age but the way you feel that makes the difference.

By expressing the generally accepted ideas in society, these formulas call for agreement with the point made by the speaker.

A big part of the data consisted of routines used as politeness devices, used to establish rapport and to say the socially expected and appropriate thing. For example:

(28) *Mübarek ellerinden öperim* [I kiss his holy hands] - This phrase carries religious overtones because of the word *mübarek* [holy]. It refers to a Turkish coustom of kissing the hand of one's seniors and touching it to one's forehead.

(29) *Basüstüne* [On the head] - meaning your wish is my command.

(30) *Buyrun beyim* [Please condescend yourself, sir] - used when offering someone something or just asking him to come in.

(31) *Zahmet etmeyin* [Please don't go to the trouble] - said when one is being offered something, not meant literally in most cases.

Other formulae were used for the purpose of giving advice or repremanding someone:

(32) *Gözmüzü acik tutalim* [We need to keep our eyes open] - meaning that we need to be cautious. This was used to warn the whole group, including the self.

(33) *Takma kafani* [Don't bother your head about it] - or sometimes meaning to repremand someone.

(34) *Agiz yapma* [Don't make mouth] - telling someone not to divert attention to other things by being verbose.

Conclusion

As previously mentioned, literal translations of these formulaic, prefabricated expressions into other languages can cause communication problems, such that, their equivalents might not exist, are not required or they are simply conveyed via other devices in different languages, especially those which are "part of a society's protocol," to borrow Davies' phrase. Indeed, misuse of these conventions of politeness is part of the 'cross-cultural pragmatic failure' (Thomas, 1983) that many learners face. In a contrastive analysis of politeness formulae, Davies (1987) shows how these show partial, complete structural or pragmatic differences.

In some situations the relationship is not bidirectional. For instance, 'goodbye' in English can be used by both the person(s) leaving and the ones staying behind. In Turkish, however, there are two formulae serving this function of leave-taking. *Allahaismaladik* [I recommend you to God] is used by the person leaving and is uttered first, whereas the one staying behind says *Güle güle* [laughingly]. Tannen and Öztek's

(1981) comparison of Turkish and Greek formulae also point out the cross-cultural differences.

What can one conclude about the functions of formulaic expressions in a language? The data presented above show them to act as politeness devices, stiuational formulae, eloquent ways of making a point in a socially acceptable and recognized way, giving the speaker devices to be tactful and the like. They help the conversation progress smoothly through the use of devices which are part of the interlocutors' communicative competence, hence not needing negotiations. They establish rapport and their use prevents the occurence of face threatening acts. The study of prefabricated routinized expressions can reveal not only a substantial part of the communicative competence of the native speakers, but can also show the values and beliefs of a society, drawing attention to conventionalized situations.

Within the body of this paper I have tried to account for the structure and functions of formulaic expressions emerging from the data. Although it was difficult to collect naturalistic data on Turkish away from the home country, the data was sufficient to show the high occurence of various formulaic expressions in Turkish. The results, nonetheless, should be evaluated only in their socio-cultural context. Language behavior is a context-dependent phenomenon, displaying changes according to social factors such as the social identity of the interlocutors, the setting, topic and the cultural norms. Although it is my strong belief that all Turkish speakers make use of formulaic expressions which are integral parts of ritualized everyday communication (to differing degrees depending on the interlocutors' social identites), I cannot justifiably generalize the sample to represent the wider population without further research.

The sample consisted mostly of lower-to-upper-middle class people between 30-55 years of age. They knew one another and shared a number of communication networks. It is interesting to note that the majority of expressions appealing to God's power were given by a woman who worked as a cleaning lady in a government office. Can it be that members of the working class use more formulaic, pre-coded utterances, as Bernstein (1972) would argue, or do they feel more powerless as people, or is this just an individual trait?

Moreover, those exaggerated formulae (see (1) and (2)) were used exclusively by women, who generally seemed to have a higher frequency of formulae in their speech, though situational formulae were used by everyone. Are there gender differences governing the use of certain formulae?

In short, despite the difficulties involved, the analysis of data posed questions for further research. In the future I hope to pursue this study, collecting spontaneous

data from different groups and doing more systematic analysis to discover factors governing the use of formulaic expressions in Turkish which mirror the values, beliefs and communicative competence of a society.

---

[1] This paper was written for a course on language and power taught by Dr. Nessa Wolfson in the fall of 1989.

References

Bahadinli, Y. (1971). Türkce Deyimler ve Keynaklari. Istanbul: Hür Yayinevi.

Bauman, R. and Sherzer, J. (1974). Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bayraktaroglu, A. (1979). Keeping the interactional balance in speech: A Turkish case. Unpublished manuscript. England.

Bernstein, B. (1972). A sociolinguistic approach to socialization; with some reference to educability. In J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (Eds.), Directions in Sociolinguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Brown, P. and Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Coulmas, F. (1979). On the sociolinguistic relevance of routine formulae. Journal of Pragmatics. 3: 239-266.

Coulmas, F. (1981a). Conversational Routine. The Hague: Mouton.

Coulmas, F. (1981b). Poison to your soul. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), Conversational Routine. The Hague: Mouton.

Davies, E. E. (1987). A contrastive approach to the analysis of politeness formulas. Applied Linguistics, 8 (1).

Drazdaukiene, M. L. (1981). On stereotypes in conversation: Their meaning and significance. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), Conversational Routine. The Hague: Mouton.

Ferguson, C. A. (1976). The structure and use of politeness formulas. Language in Society. 5(2):137-51.

Gleason, J. and Weintraub, S. (1975). The acquisition of routine formulas in child language. Language in Society 5(2) : 129-136.

Goffman, E. (1971). Relations in Public. Philadelphia: Harper and Row.

Hakuta, K. (1974). A preliminary report of the development of grammatical morphemes in a Japanese girl learning English as a second language. Working Papers on Bilingualism 3 : 18-43.

Hatch, E. (1978). Discourse Analysis and second language acquisition. In E. Hatch (Ed), Second Language Acquisition. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Hymes, D. (1968). The ethnography of speaking. In J. Fishman (Ed.), Readings in the Sociology of Language. The Hague: Mouton.

Irvine, J. (1974). Strategies of status manipulation in the Wolof greeting. In R. Bauman and J. Sherzer (Eds.), Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

James, C. (1980). Contrastive Analysis. London: Longman.

Keller, E. (1981). Gambits: Conversational strategy signals. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), Conversational Routine. The Hague: Mouton.

Malinowski, B. (1923). The problem of meaning in primitive languages. In Ogden and Richards (Eds.), The Meaning of Meaning. London:Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Manes, J. and Wolfson, N. (1981). The compliment formula. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), Conversational Routine. The Hague: Mouton.

Matisoff, J. A. (1979). Blessings, Curses, Hopes and Fears: Psycho-Ostensive Expressions in Yiddish. Philadelphia: Institute of the Study of Human Issues.

Nwoye, O. (1989). Linguistic politeness in Igbo. Multilingua. 8.

Oy, A. (1972). Tarih Boyunca Türk Atasözleri. Istanbul: Hür Yayinevi

Richards, J. C. and Sukwiwat, M. (1983). Language transfer and conversational competence. Applied Linguistics 4(2) : 113-125.

Riley, P. (1981). Towards a contrastive sociolinguistics. In J. Fisiak (Ed.), Contrastive Linguistics and the Language Teacher. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Seitel, P. (1976). Proverbs: A social use of metaphor. In D. Ben-Amos (Ed.), Folklore Genres. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Sorhus, H. B. (1977). To hear ourselves: Implications for teaching English as a second language. English Language Teaching Journal. 31(3); 211-221.

Tannen, D. and Öztek, P. (1981). Health to our mouths: Formulaic expressions in Greek and Turkish. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), Conversational Routine. The Hague: Mouton.

Thomas, J. (1983). Cross-cultural pragmatic failure. Applied Linguistics 4(2): 91-112.

Verschueren, D. (1981). The semantics of forgotten routines. In F. Coulmas (Ed.), Conversational Routine. The Hague: Mouton.